



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

forced by dint of his perseverance and good management to abandon, step by step, every position behind which they were entrenched ; and these wearisome negotiations were finally closed by the treaty of peace between Holland and Belgium, and both countries left free to pursue a career of recovered prosperity. The great obstacle to Dutch repose and confidence was the King, whose financial operations were driving the country headlong to ruin. But his abdication, some months back, gave the gallant Prince of Orange an earlier accession to the throne, than "the course of nature" promised him ; and his generous sacrifices for his country have found their reward, by his being placed at its head before a too advanced age had weakened his powers of government. He and his former rival, Leopold, are now running their parallel careers of kingcraft ; and (if left by the other monarchs to the unobstructed exercise of their really fine qualities) with every chance of making their respective portions of the *quondam* Kingdom of the Netherlands contented with themselves and with each other.

ART. VI. — *A Classical Dictionary. Containing an Account of the principal Proper Names mentioned in Ancient Authors, and intended to elucidate all the important Points connected with the Geography, History, Biography, Mythology, and Fine Arts of the Greeks and Romans. Together with an Account of Coins, Weights, and Measures, with Tabular Values of the same.* By CHARLES ANTHON, LL. D., Jay Professor of the Greek and Latin Languages in Columbia College, New York, and Rector of the Grammar School. New York : Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. viii. and 1423.

It is no easy thing to strike the right medium in the preparation of such a book as a classical dictionary. The claims of the schoolboy, just beginning his acquaintance with the historical and mythological personages of antiquity, demand attention first. Next comes the college student, with his more enlarged views and wider information. Lastly, the educated

man, who, amidst professional cares, loves to turn, from time to time, to the ancient fountains,

— “*Integros accedere fontes
Atque haurire,*”

to refresh his jaded mind by calling up the classical associations of his youth, needs a work, that shall help him to revive the faded impressions of early studies, by giving, in a clear and condensed form, information about persons and things and places, that figure in his favorite authors. A work that shall meet and answer all these demands, must be the result of the varied researches of many minds. The number of topics which must necessarily be treated in it, and their frequent difficulty ; the doubts that hang over them, and the contradictory opinions of scholars and critics, make the task of preparing a well-proportioned work of this kind, the labor of a life. It requires a most minute acquaintance with the great works of antiquity, the history of the classic ages, the institutions of ancient nations, their mythology, manners and customs, their philosophy and legislation, and the successive changes that all these underwent, from age to age. It requires, also an extensive and profound knowledge of the researches of modern scholars, a keen discrimination between the useful and the useless, in the immense mass of materials which their learned labors have accumulated ; and, to crown the whole, it requires a mind at once comprehensive and exact, and an industry which patiently submits to long and wearisome investigation for the purpose of establishing, on the best testimony, the probability or certainty of facts, and of selecting from conflicting statements those which are consistent with common sense, harmonious with each other, and in keeping with the admitted facts of analogous cases.

We do not know a work in any language, that quite fulfils all these conditions. Much has been done on single subjects, both in separate treatises and in contributions to the periodical literature of the last half-century, but no man has been yet found to unite these scattered fragments into an exact, comprehensive, and satisfactory whole. By far the best attempt within our knowledge is Dr. S. F. W. Hoffmann's *Alterthumswissenschaft*, published at Leipsic. This is a work of very uncommon merit. The amount and variety of information which the able and learned author has brought together, upon every part of the science of antiquity, and the admirable

manner in which this is digested and arranged, make the work incomparably the best of its kind that has yet appeared. But, as it extends to many subjects that are not usually embraced within the range of a classical dictionary, the author is obliged to condense greatly those subjects that are. This book is greatly superior to the "Manual" of Eschenburg, of which Professor Fisk, of Amherst, furnished, a few years since, an excellent translation. Eschenburg's work has been superseded by later inquiries of the eminent scholars of Germany. It is in several points exceedingly defective, though many of its defects have been ably supplied by the American translator and editor. After all, we should perhaps prefer a work on the plan of Eschenburg and Hoffmann, to one on the more limited scheme of the English Dictionary. The introductory parts of Hoffmann's work on the *Ground Sciences* (*Grund-wissenschaften*), Grammar, Hermeneutics or Interpretation, Criticism; and on the *Real Sciences* (*Real-wissenschaften*), Ancient Geography, Chronology, Political History, Antiquities, Mythology, Literary History, and Archæology, contain the most thorough, systematic, condensed, and elaborate exhibitions of those subjects with which we are acquainted. They are of inestimable value to the classical scholar.

We do not see any reason for separating a classical dictionary from a dictionary of antiquities,—literary history from the history of ancient art. The classical student needs the one as well as the other, in the course of his inquiries. It is true, that a dictionary of persons and places, arranged in alphabetical order, has some advantage in the superior convenience of consultation, when information on a single person or place only is sought for: but manuals systematically arranged, like those of Eschenburg and Hoffmann, present their subjects grouped in a more natural connexion, and furnish the information required in a more complete and interesting form. The English classical dictionaries require another of antiquities; and this other has not, until very recently, been forthcoming. An excellent work of this description, under the title of "A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," is now publishing in London. The compilers use freely the works of modern German writers, Müller, Thiersch, Böckh, Wachsmuth, Herrmann, Niebuhr, Savigny, Hugo, and others; and, so far as we have had an opportunity of examining the articles hitherto published, they are executed with

uncommon ability, taste, and learning. Works of this description will soon put a new aspect on English classical scholarship, which has, in times past, been too limited in its range, and too mechanical in its spirit, producing men of great sagacity, refined taste, and, in some points, minute erudition ; but rarely a scholar of comprehensive learning, as compared with the principal philologists of Germany. It would be absurd to set up the Burgesses, the Burneys, the Marklands, the Elmsleys, the Tates, and the Porsons, against such men as Wolf and Heyne, Herrmann, Böckh, and K. O. Müller.

It is a striking mark of the inactivity of English classical scholars, that Lempriere's "Classical Dictionary" was allowed to reign paramount so many years in the English schools. It was, in its day, a meritorious work, and creditable to the learning and industry of its author. It was even translated into Latin, by a Dutch scholar, and had some currency on the continent. After passing through many editions during the author's lifetime, which closed in 1824, it began to be revised, added to, and altered by other scholars, both in England and in the United States. Several editions have been published by Professor Anthon, of Columbia College, New York, in which important additions were introduced. These were reprinted in England, under the editorial care of Mr. E. H. Barker, one of the contributors to the "Classical Journal." This gentleman and Professor Anthon have been indulging a habit of exchanging honeyed compliments across the Atlantic, to the great satisfaction and improvement of the learned public. Mr. Barker is a somewhat conspicuous specimen of pedantry without much ability ; and if we may judge from his prefaces, of a keen mercantile eye for the main chance. It is amusing to see what pains he takes to caution purchasers against being imposed upon by the proprietors of the original work, who were so unreasonable as to try to palm off their wares, when everybody ought to have known that none were genuine except those signed "E. H. Barker." He professes also to have corrected various inelegancies of expression used by Dr. Lempriere, and otherwise improved many of his articles. It is very singular that a person like Mr. Barker, whose prefaces are written in an awkward and contemptible English style, should presume to touch the easy, flowing, and polished paragraphs of Dr. Lempriere. But we must not dwell upon the merits or demerits

Mr. E. H. Barker. Those who are curious to know in what estimation his literary character has been held at home among the real scholars of England may find some pithy comments in the seventh number of the "*Museum Criticum*," (page 510.)

Dr. Anthon is a scholar of a far higher character and more distinguished abilities than Mr. Barker. He has rendered real and great service to the classical scholars of both countries, by the additions and improvements he has introduced into his successive editions of Lempriere; and his own articles, — though few and far between, — are generally marked by an easy and correct English style. We say "generally"; for the learned Professor in his own recently published Dictionary has the bad taste to repeat, again and again, that noted vulgarism, — sanctioned, it is true, by Walter Scott, but none the less a vulgarism on that account, — of using *would* for *should*, as "*We would err*," for "*We should err*." Dr. Anthon's editions of Lempriere have been favorably received, and have met with an extensive sale. But, with all the additions that were made to it, the work of Dr. Lempriere was found insufficient for the increasing attention paid to classical learning, and Dr. Anthon wisely resolved on making a new book. This has lately appeared under the title placed at the head of the present article. It has been received with praises more extravagant than critical, trumpeted forth by the clamorous tongues of the daily and weekly press, in a style of eulogy that would go far to damn it in the estimation of persons qualified to pronounce upon its merits. It must be a work of no ordinary character to bear up under the storm of applause which "hushed in grim repose, expects" each new publication of Professor Anthon. A rapid sale and large profits are pleasant things no doubt both to publisher and author; but when they are obtained at the cost of scholar-like accuracy, and permanent utility, they are too dearly purchased.

We have been in the habit of consulting Dr. Anthon's new Dictionary for some time past, and have satisfied ourselves that it is the best book of its kind in the English language. This is not saying much. We are satisfied that it is in some respects a good book without reference to any other. It is a book that does honor to the learning and industry, though not to the judgment and accuracy, of Dr. Anthon. Both scholars and teachers will thank him for the information he has collected for them. He has drawn upon the principal works of modern criticism, and his compilation is a valuable

repository of facts and speculations for the use of the classical scholar. In the various departments of biography, mythology, and geography, he has done a great deal towards furnishing the student with ample though not always precise and well-digested information.

But we are compelled to say that the book is not what it ought to be, coming from a man whose means are so abundant as Professor Anthon's to make it a work of first-rate excellence. He has hurried it altogether too much. Two years, the time he speaks in his preface of having devoted to its preparation, are not enough even for his indefatigable and vigorous intellect. He should have given at least ten years of labor to a task of such magnitude and extent. The vast variety of the materials, necessary to be used in such an undertaking, cannot be reduced to order and wrought into a homogeneous whole with such railroad speed. No human being can examine, compare, combine, and digest them as they ought to be digested, in a work of the high pretensions of Anthon's "*Classical Dictionary*." There must be omissions, inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and contradictions without number. We say there *must* be, in a work prepared with so much haste. Haste is Professor Anthon's besetting sin. Not one of the long row of volumes that he has published, fails to show his great learning, his great capacity for labor, and at the same time his great liability to error; hardly one of his volumes is not deformed by mistakes, that seriously impair its usefulness as a work to be placed in the hands of young students. The time will come when this characteristic will be fully exposed, and the professor's name will be subjected to the penalty of a diminished literary reputation. The scholars of the country will sooner or later learn to scrutinize, as well as to eulogize. At present, newspaper editors and certain presidents of colleges, whose classical knowledge scarcely extends beyond the merest elements, are taken as the highest literary authority upon the merits of his works.

A classical dictionary ought to contain not only all the names of persons and places to be met with in the common school and college classics, but such as the general reader will be likely to find in the political and literary history of the Greeks and Romans. It is no reason for omitting the name of a person, that only a few circumstances respecting him are known. A classical dictionary is the very book in which those few circumstances ought to be recorded,

and where the student ought to be able to find them. Especially the names of persons who have taken an important part in cultivating any particular branch of literature, ought to be scrupulously recorded, however slight may be the remaining vestiges of their works. Philosophers, of whom only the name and fame have descended to our times ; statesmen and generals, great men and renowned in their day, but existing only as mighty shades, εἰδωλα καμόντων, in the pages of history, should take their place, and occupy their little niche in a classical dictionary. But this cannot be done in two years, even with all the resources of German scholarship at command. Dr. Anthon's work is materially defective in this respect, as will hereafter be shown. There is also a want of proportion very perceptible, which springs no doubt from the same cause,—the hasty manner in which the book was prepared. Things of no consequence are frequently discussed at great length, while others of real value are summarily despatched. Speculations on doubtful points of mythology,—the delusive freaks of allegorical interpretation,—discussions of obscure questions touching the connexions between Greece and the East, between Greek literature and Sanscrit philology,—matters, it is true, of curiosity and interest,—are too frequently brought in, to the exclusion of others which it was the more immediate duty of the author of this book to supply. We are not prepared to say that such topics should be wholly excluded ; but, where the choice lies between them, and brief notices of a series of lyric poets, we think there can be no question which ought to be chosen and which to be left, even though a magnificent show of erudition may have to be sacrificed in consequence.

We do not altogether like the manner in which the principal articles in Dr. Anthon's book are composed. One would infer, from the way in which he speaks of his labors in the preface, that the articles had all been written by himself. This is very far from being the case. Many, if not all the most important, are taken,—not merely compiled, but taken, in their very words,—from other writers. Here and there a sentence is omitted, the arrangement slightly altered, or a phrase changed, for the purpose of interweaving a paragraph drawn from some other source. The references to the original authorities are also copied, apparently without verification ; at least in some instances we have found erroneous references in the book from which Dr. Anthon has drawn, exactly copied in the Diction-

ary. Now this is not the way to make a book of permanent utility, or brilliant reputation. All these materials ought to have been freely used by Dr. Anthon ; but then he should have digested, arranged, and verified, and the articles should have been written in his own language, not copying individual writers, but combining all that can be collected from all writers. The effects of a different mode of proceeding are obvious enough; the book is any thing but a homogeneous whole. It is diversified by styles as numerous as the authors in Dr. Anthon's library. He ought to have personally verified every reference to the classics ; for these references form one of the most important portions of such a work to every classical scholar, and where they are carelessly and incorrectly made, the value of the work is materially diminished. Dr. Anthon's Dictionary abounds in errors of this sort. Every one, at all accustomed to classical researches, knows how common these errors are, even in the works of careful writers, and how necessary it is to follow them up with the closest attention. As a general rule, it will never do to take a reference at second hand. Dr. Anthon has apparently done so, and the chances, in any given case, are that the reader who attempts to find the cited passage by means of Dr. Anthon's reference, will be sent on a fool's errand. Besides this, the edition quoted from ought in all cases to be specified ; otherwise it will frequently happen, from the different arrangements in different editions, that it will be impossible to verify the citation, without resorting to other guides.

Another consequence of this mode of quoting the very words of other writers is, that inconsistent statements are often made in different parts of the book, and the young scholar will of course be at a loss which to assume as the correct one. Dr. Anthon ought to have given himself time to compare, in cases of this kind, and to decide which was correct, or most likely to be so. It is obvious that all this could not be done in two years, and therefore we claim the right of censuring him for getting up the work as if a speedy publication were an affair of life and death. It is startling to read contradictions like the following, which we take from articles on names so well known as those of Demosthenes and Æschines. Speaking of the prosecution brought by Æschines against Ctesiphon, in the article "Demosthenes," he says ; "The matter remained for some time pending, in consequence of the interruption which public business of all kinds met with during the

embarrassments and troubles that preceded the battle of Chæroneæ." In the article *Æschines*, the following account is given of the matter; "Their most famous controversy was that which related to the *Crown*. A little after the battle of Chæroneæ, Demosthenes was commissioned to repair the fortifications of Athens. He expended in the performance of this task, thirteen talents, ten of which he received from the public treasury, while the remaining three were generously given from his own private purse. As a mark of public gratitude for this act of liberality, Ctesiphon proposed to the people to decree a crown of gold to the orator. *Æschines* immediately preferred an impeachment, &c. This celebrated cause, after having been delayed some time in consequence of the troubles attendant on the death of Philip, was at last brought to a hearing," &c. Such a contradiction is inexcusable. If his authorities were at variance upon this point, surely the Professor should have taken the trouble to make his own statements harmonize. The account of the matter, given in the article last cited, is imperfect, but true as far as it goes. It had already been postponed nearly two years when Philip was assassinated. The postponement for six years longer was probably caused by that event, and its consequences. The statement with regard to the bribe of Harpalus, is too strong. "Demosthenes was condemned for having suffered himself to be bribed by Harpalus, a Macedonian governor," &c. The truth is, Demosthenes, like a victim who lost his head during the Reign of Terror, was *suspected of being suspected* of bribery, and on this ground, was condemned by the enlightened judges of Athens. The evidence against Demosthenes never amounted to any thing, and the charge was inconsistent with the tenor of the great orator's life. The subject is well discussed by Thirlwall in his "*History of Greece*," but we have no room for more than this passing allusion to it here. Suffice it to say, that it rests wholly on the calumnies of Dinarchus, the venal speech-maker, the *barley Demosthenes*, and the gossiping stories of Plutarch. It is refuted by a chain of probable reasoning which leaves scarcely a doubt upon any candid mind. The reader may consult Thirlwall, (Vol. VII. p. 152, sqq.), for an able examination of the question. "Of all political characters," says Heeren, (*Politics of Greece*, p. 276 of Bancroft's translation,) "Demosthenes is the most sublime, and the finest tragic character, with which history is acquainted."

In the account of Demosthenes, one of the Athenian generals in the Sicilian expedition, this statement occurs ; “Demosthenes and Nicias were both taken prisoners, and destroyed themselves, while in confinement, on hearing that the Syracusans were deliberating about putting them both to death. Another account, alluded to by Plutarch, makes them to have been stoned to death.” In the article on Nicias, the same event is thus described ; “In endeavouring to retreat by land from before Syracuse, the Athenian commanders, Nicias and Demosthenes, were pursued, defeated, and compelled to surrender. The generals were put to death ; their soldiers were confined at first in the quarry of Epipolæ, and afterwards sold as slaves.” This is correct ; of course the other is wrong. Thucydides is the only trustworthy authority upon the events of this ill-starred expedition. The minute and graphic account he has left us forms one of the most masterly pieces of historical painting in the literature of the world. With regard to the death of the generals, his language is clear, and positive. “The rest of the Athenians,” says he, “and of their allies, whom they [the Sicilians] had captured, they conveyed down into the stone quarries, regarding this as the safest way of keeping them ; but they put Nicias and Demosthenes to death, against the wishes of Gylippus.” *Νικίαν δὲ καὶ Δημοσθένην, ἄκοντος τοῦ Γυλῖππου, ἀπέσφαξαν.* Lib. VII. c. 86.

The articles on the orators are generally well written and satisfactory, and the sketches of their works drawn up with good judgment. We notice, occasionally, the same effects of haste here that are elsewhere observable. The biographies are too general ; characteristic and well known facts are omitted, because they happen to be omitted by Dr. Anthon's authorities. In the life of Æschines, his presence at the battle of Mantinea when he was twenty-seven years old, and eight years after at the fight of Tamynæ, with other military services, which received the applause of his countrymen, are passed over. These are of importance, in the scantiness of the information we possess concerning that orator. We find, too, mistakes that a moderate degree of carefulness would have rendered impossible. Under the name of Isocrates, we meet with this statement. “He is said to have charged one thousand drachmæ (nearly 1800 dollars) for a complete course of oratorical instruction, and to have said to some one who found fault with the largeness of the amount, that he would willingly give ten thousand drachmæ, to any one who

should impart to him the self-confidence and the command of voice requisite in a public orator." The anecdote is related by Plutarch, who also tells a story of Demosthenes declaring to Isocrates that he could not pay the thousand drachmæ, and begging to be allowed to purchase one fourth of the course for two hundred ; to which the old rhetorician replied, " We do not cut up our business ; but, as they sell fine fishes whole, so, if you will become a disciple, I will give you the art entire." If the terms of Isocrates had been, what Dr. Anthon represents them, we doubt whether even Isocrates would have commanded many pupils. But by some strange mistake he makes the sum nearly ten times as great as it really was. A thousand drachmæ amount to only \$ 170, or \$ 175. Taking the table printed at the end of the Dictionary as correct, and it is nearly so, one drachme is 17cts., 5m.; one thousand, of course, are one hundred and seventy-five dollars ; and even this, considering the superior value of money then, as compared with the present, is a pretty high price for a single course of rhetorical lessons ; ten times as much would have placed the instructions of Isocrates beyond the reach of the richest citizens of Athens. We have also to censure the omission of all mention of Theodorus, the father of Isocrates, a respectable citizen, and wealthy enough to bear his part in the *liturgies*, and to educate his three sons, — the orator, Telesippus, and Diomnestus. Neither of the last two, by the way, is alluded to in the Dictionary. Theramenes also is not enumerated among his instructors, though that circumstance is important in connexion with the fact afterwards stated, — so honorable to the character of Isocrates, — of his daring to defend the Oligarch when that able, but unprincipled man, fell under the sweeping proscription of his peers among the Thirty.

Dr. Anthon says of Lempriere's Dictionary, that " its language was frequently marked by a grossness of allusion, which rendered the book a very unfit one to be put into the hands of the young ; " and of his own, that, " in preparing the mythological articles, the greatest care has been taken to exclude from them every thing offensive, either in language or detail, and to present such a view of the several topics connected with this department of inquiry, as may satisfy the most scrupulous, and make the present work a safe guide, in a moral point of view, to the young of either sex." No doubt there is room, in a matter like this, for the exercise of a sound dis-

cretion ; but as to treating ancient mythology in a manner which shall "exclude every thing offensive, either in language or detail," the thing is impossible. The subject is essentially gross in many of its parts ; and this grossness it is out of the question to disguise or conceal, without leaving the treatment of it extremely imperfect. Besides, it is very possible to handle such a subject, without doing harm to the modesty of the youthful reader. Its baseness may be shown only to be detested. There is no need of dwelling on licentious details, so as to inflame the passions. They may be referred to in general terms, as matters of fact, with sufficient distinctness for all the purposes of information. But if they are studiously kept out of sight, the view presented of ancient morals, and of mythology, will be imperfect and false. The curiosity of the young is likely to be much more injuriously excited by keeping objectionable details out of view, and, at the same time, intimating that there is something very naughty, but that it is too bad to be mentioned. We think Dr. Anthon has carried this notion too far ; the principle is a wrong one. Plain dealing with young scholars is a great deal better than mystery, as well in the slippery parts of ancient mythology, as in other matters ; and this, upon a very obvious principle of human nature, that mystery upon forbidden topics excites a prurient curiosity, which gives them a dangerous power over the imagination ; whereas downright plainness of speech strips the subject of its fascination, and sets it before the mind just as it is. We do not take it upon ourselves to affirm that Lempriere has not managed these matters sometimes with a censurable freedom ; we think he has, and that Professor Anthon deserves the thanks of the public for avoiding this error. But, in the language of the Professor's friend, Mr. Barker, "An important fact, connected with history, or mythology, or theology, ought not to be suppressed, lest its insertion should offend the nauseous niceness of a tender-stomached critic. Is not *such* fastidiousness the mere affectation of old-maidish prudery, when it is considered that all matter of this sort is extracted from those ancient poets and writers, who are set before youth in the course of a classical education ?"

In another part of his preface, Dr. Anthon says ; "The editor was employed to prepare a work, which, while it should embrace all that was valuable in the additions that had, from time to time, been made by him, was to retain no por-

tion whatever of the old matter of Lempriere, but to supply its place with newly written articles. This has now accordingly been done." This statement is not strictly correct. Very few newly written articles will be found in the volume, though other articles are often substituted for those of Lempriere. But they are in the very words, as we have before remarked, of other writers. Besides, many of the less important articles and parts of other articles, are substantially retained from Lempriere. To take the first example that comes to hand. Plutarch, in the life of Isocrates, relates an incident that took place while the rhetorician was present at an entertainment, in company with Nicocreon, a tyrant of some historical note. Of this person, Lempriere gives the following brief account ; " Nicocreon, a tyrant of Salamis, in the age of Alexander the Great. He ordered the philosopher Anaxarchus to be pounded to pieces in a mortar." Precisely the same thing is stated in Anthon's edition of Lempriere, excepting that by striking out the period after *Great*, and the pronoun *He*, it is thrown into a single sentence. In Anthon's own Dictionary it stands thus ; " Nicocreon, a tyrant of Salamis, in the age of Alexander the Great. A fabulous story is related of his having caused the philosopher, Anaxarchus, to be pounded alive in a mortar." The reader will perceive, that, while the language is slightly varied, the only thing which needed alteration stands just as it does in Lempriere. Nicocreon is called the tyrant of Salamis, by Lempriere ; he is followed by Anthon in the corrected edition, and in his own work. Lempriere was wrong, and, of course, Anthon is wrong. Nicocreon was the tyrant of Cyprus, and is known as such in history ; he is spoken of as such, wherever he is referred to, in other articles, by Lempriere, and by Anthon. Lempriere, perhaps, might have had in his mind the little town of Salamis, on the island of Cyprus. Nicocreon may have been mentioned somewhere as living in this town, or belonging to it ; but the statement is made, precisely as if Nicocreon had been tyrant of *the* Salamis ; no young reader would or could understand it otherwise, and probably Dr. Lempriere himself wrote it so in a careless moment. Dr. Anthon appears to have copied him without inquiry. Had it been otherwise, Nicocreon would have been called, either " the tyrant of Cyprus," or " the tyrant of Salamis, on the island of Cyprus " ; at least he ought to have been called so. Many

other cases of this kind occur, but we have not room to enlarge upon this branch of our subject.

The article on Homer is long and interesting. It is much better than any thing written on the subject by Lempriere. But nearly the whole of it is taken, *verbatim*, from the tasteful and elegant little book of Henry Nelson Coleridge ; a book, we may add, which ought to be in the hands of every reader of Homer. It is a volume that combines a fine critical spirit, a feeling of literary excellence, drawn from a familiar acquaintance with the highest works of genius, in different ages, and an enthusiastic admiration of the Homeric poetry.

We have examined Dr. Anthon's work to some extent in the literary history of Greek lyric and dramatic poetry. We have noticed in both departments a number of omissions, which we think ought not to have been allowed. It is true, that time has made mournful havoc both in the lyric and the dramatic poetry of the Greeks. With the immortal exception of Pindar, — and even of his works but a small portion remains, — nothing is left but short pieces or fragments of all that mass of minstrelsy, which filled up the interval between the epic and dramatic age ; single and broken rays from that flood of light, which once encircled like a glory, the Grecian Isles. Still many names and facts have come down to us ; and single lines of exquisite beauty, preserved here and there, in the old grammarians, lexicographers, and scholiasts, and particularly in Athenæus, testify to the excellence of schools of poetry now lost for ever. All these names and facts should be carefully brought together in such a dictionary as Dr. Anthon's, but we find a very large portion of them passed over in silence. Why did he say nothing of Thaletas of Crete, the Doric poet, and a noted author of Pæans and Hyporchemes ? why nothing of a long line of Spartan lyrists, who produced immense numbers of lyric poems, beginning from the very earliest times ? nothing of Gnesippus, the famous author of antique serenades, according to Athenæus, and to the author of the " Helots " by him cited ;

— 'Ο δὲ Γήσιππος ἔστ' ἀκούειν
 "Ὅς νυκτεριν' εἶρε μυχοῖς αἰσμάτων' ἐκκαλεῖσθαι
 Γυναικας ἔχοντας ἰαμβύκην τὲ καὶ τρίγωνον.

This ancient poet, of sport and pleasure, fell under the lash of the Attic comedians, being satyriized in three several pieces by Cratinus ; and he was charged with infamous vices by Telecleides, as Athenæus relates. His poetry, however,

was highly esteemed, and Clearchus declared, that his erotic and Locrian pieces were in no respect inferior to the poems of Sappho and Anacreon. We have also the names of the Spartan poets Areos, Eurytus, Zarex, Spendo, Dionysodotus, Xenodamus, and Gitiadas, who, according to the testimony of the ancients, were distinguished contributors to that splendid poetry, which braced up the martial spirit of the stern old Spartans. Not one is mentioned by Anthon. Of the famous poetesses, Megalostrata, referred to with respect by Alcman; Cleitagora, spoken of by a scholiast on Aristophanes; Telesilla, of Argos, renowned not less for her poetic powers than for her heroic qualities, and mentioned by Plutarch, Pausanias, and Athenæus; Praxilla, of Sicyon, famed as a dithyambic poetess, after whom, according to Hephæstion, a dactylic metre was called the Praxilleian, and another, the Ionic a majori, brachycatalectic trimeter, (we beg pardon for using words of such "learned length and thundering sound,") was also named; Nossis, the Locrian, some of whose epigrams are preserved in the Anthology; Aristomache, the Erythræan poetess, the victor in the Isthmian games, and author of the "Golden Book," deposited in the treasury of Sicyon; of all these Dr. Anthon has not a word to say, though they were numbered among the nine lyric muses of antiquity. We find no mention made of Xenocritus, the Locrian poet, the founder of a new epoch in Grecian music, and the inventor, or perfecter, of the Locrian harmony; * nor of Xenodamas, the poet of Cythera; nor of Eunomus, Erasippus, and Mnaseas, the Locrian poets, of whom Bode remarks, that "they elevated anew the fame of the Locrian poetical culture, and are to be regarded as the prominent leaders of a series of singers, who formed, after Xenocritus, a peculiar school, and succeeded in lending to their creations a certain distinctive character" ("Geschichte der Hellenischen Dichtkunst," B. 2. T. 2, p. 44). No mention is made of Damon, who, according to Plutarch, invented a Hypolydian mood; nor of Xanthus and Sacadas, the *melic* poets, and predecessors of Stesichorus, the former of whom is commemorated by Stesichorus himself, and the latter composed elegies, and a poem on the Destruction of Troy, (*Ἰλίου πέποις*,) and was a victor at the Pythian games. (Ol. 48. 3.)

* The Scholiast on Pindar says: Δοκεῖσθαι γὰρ τις ἀρμονία ἔστιν, ἣν ἀσκησάμενοι Ξενοκρίτων τὸν Δοκρόν.

These are only a small portion of the names, the omission of which we have had occasion to observe. They are names of considerable importance in the history of Greek literature, though but scanty notices of their works have reached us. Not one of them, but should have been found in a classical dictionary professing to give ample details on the history of ancient literature. Many names of much less importance, — for example Anyte, the poetess, — are actually found in Dr. Anthon's book. Of this we do not complain, but have only to say, that the others should have been inserted there too. We are the more surprised at the omission, as they all occur in a learned and able work, cited above, Dr. G. H. Bode's "History of Greek Poetry," which is mentioned in the catalogue of books prefixed to Dr. Anthon's Dictionary. If the Professor had taken the trouble to consult this very laborious and excellent work, he would have found there the requisite information, well arranged and clearly stated. These names and many others would not have occupied much space. They would have been much more appropriately inserted in a classical dictionary than the Professor's speculations on mythology and Sanscrit philology, or even than that ingenious argument to prove the impossibility of the existence of giants, to which he complacently alludes in one of his prefaces, but which belongs rather to the science of natural history or comparative anatomy, than to classical literature. By lopping off these useless excrescences, room enough might have been made for all the names we have mentioned and a great many other pertinent subjects, which have been passed over, to the serious diminution of the value of the Dictionary.

The lives of the dramatic poets, Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides are taken chiefly from a useful and learned volume, published some years ago at Cambridge, in England, under the title of the "Theatre of the Greeks, or the History, Literature, and Criticism of the Grecian Drama." This work is a compilation from Genelli, Schlegel, and others, and contains a great variety of information. It is a work of considerable utility to the student of the Attic drama; but it is defective in some points, and incorrect in others. It should have contained, for example, some account of the laws that were enacted from time to time to regulate the dramatic poets, and particularly of the measures adopted by the Thirty Tyrants to suppress the freedom of the comic theatre. This is one of its defects. It is also affirmed that women

were undoubtedly accustomed to attend the theatrical exhibitions. This is an error ; or at least the stronger probability lies the other way. The compiler of the book was probably unacquainted with the acute and learned essays of Böttiger, the greatest antiquary of modern times, on this very subject, and with the almost irresistible argument that great scholar advances in support of the negative side of the question. Professor Anthon follows the English compiler implicitly, altering a word or phrase here and there, and sometimes falling into mistakes when he does so. For example, in a note to the life of Aristophanes, in the work referred to, there is a statement of the probable age of the poet, upon grounds there mentioned. For reasons specified, the writer assumes B. C. 456, as the year of his birth ; and says, for certain other reasons also specified, "Hence we may fix his death, with some degree of certainty, at or about B. C. 380, which would make him then nearly eighty years of age." The statement in this form is correct. Dr. Anthon has taken these data, but making some verbal alterations, puts forth the statement thus ; "The exact dates of his birth and death are equally unknown ; the former, however, has been fixed with some degree of probability at B. C. 456, and the latter at B. C. 380, when he would be eighty years of age." Dr. Anthon's authority says that he died *at or about* B. C. 380, which would make him *nearly* eighty years of age. Dr. Anthon, not taking the trouble to compare the numbers, states roundly, omitting the qualifying words, *at or about*, and *nearly*, that he *would* be eighty years of age. Of course if the dates of his birth and death were as above given, he was seventy-six years old when he died, as the Professor would have found out by subtracting 380 from 456, — no very difficult problem.

In the book we have spoken of, the authorities are referred to in notes at the bottom of the page. These references are inserted by Dr. Anthon, in the body of the text, sometimes, if not always, without verification. The substance also of the notes, when they contain other matters besides the references to authors, is also transferred to the text, and interwoven with other borrowed discussions. This is the manner in which all the important articles on the literature and criticism of the Greek drama are made up. The long and able account of the theatre, which is particularly referred to in Dr. Anthon's preface, is taken from the work already mentioned, and constructed as above described. The compiler of that

work borrowed it principally from Genelli, whose work on the Attic Theatre is a standard authority on most points connected with the subject. The main body of the treatise on the "Theatre of the Greeks" is distributed under the several heads of, "History of Tragedy from its Rise to the Time of Æschylus,"— then follow, with the biographies, criticisms on the tragic and comic poets,— "The Dramatic Contests," "The Theatre and Audience," "The Actors and Chorus," "Dresses," &c. Dr. Anthon has taken out the biographies from their place, and copied them in his separate articles on the poets; but he has adopted the same order in the other subjects, which is observed by the compiler. The entire discussions upon all these points are copied from the work in question, — mostly in the very words of the compilation. It is true, the work is referred to, but only as the other authorities are referred to. There is no intimation, that the entire article, with slight and unimportant modifications, is transferred from the compilation to the Dictionary.

We have stated that Dr. Anthon had probably copied the references to the authorities without verification. Our reason for making this statement is, that in some instances we have found the mistakes in the references repeated by Dr. Anthon. A single instance of this will be sufficient to illustrate what is meant. In the article we have just been considering there is a reference to Theophrastus, *Char.* 11. as authority for the statement that "the lessee sometimes gave a gratuitous exhibition, in which case tickets of admission were distributed." Turning to the same subject in the "Theatre," we find, in a foot-note, the passage cited in the original Greek, and the reference in Roman letters, *Char.* XI. It should have been Theophrastus, *Char.* XXX.

Professor Anthon has nothing to say of the laws regulating theatrical exhibitions, we presume because nothing is said by the compiler. We remember seeing it remarked by one of our contemporaries, that the name of Lamachus, the author of a law restraining the license of the comic theatre, was omitted by Professor Anthon, — the authority relied upon by the reviewer being Schöll. The answer to this was that Lamachus in Schöll was a mere misprint for Antimachus; but, if the reviewer had looked after the tyrant of ancient comedy under the *alias* of Antimachus, he would have been compelled equally to make the return, *Non est inventus*. In a note on page 120 of the volume so often referred to, the question of the pres-

ence of females at theatrical representations is briefly discussed and authoritatively decided in the affirmative. Professor Anthon copies the substance of the note, and all the references, as if he were expressing his own opinions, thus. "We have no doubt that women were admitted to the dramatic exhibitions. Julius Pollux uses the term *θηατρολα*," &c. As we before intimated, we regard this statement in the compilation and the Dictionary, at least in the form in which it is given by both, as a mistake. The Professor should have copied the doubts hinted at by the compiler, as well as the strong conclusion at which he arrives. Böttiger, whose name has already been quoted upon this point, examined the subject most minutely, and argued it with ingenuity and erudition, in three essays, published originally, the first two in Wieland's "*Deutscher Mercur*" for 1796 and 1797, and the third in the "*Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände*," 1808, (Numbers 309 – 311;) and republished in Sillig's collection of Böttiger's "*Kleine Schriften*," (Vol. I. p. 293, *et seq.*) These essays are a beautiful specimen of antiquarian research, and an excellent model of scholar-like disquisition; learned, but lively; minute, without being tedious; comprehensive and conclusive. No scholar can be on a level with the literature of this curious question until he has become familiar with them.

We observe in the philosophical articles, that a great deal has been borrowed from the English translation of Ritter's "*History of Philosophy*." A great part of the elaborate account of Plato, for example, is very closely copied from that translation. Professor Anthon ought to have used the original, *and the second edition*; for Ritter saw reason to make many important alterations, particularly with regard to the views he had presented of Plato and the Platonic philosophy. The first edition of his work was carefully examined in one of the learned journals of Germany, — Jahn's "*Jahrbuch der Philologie*," we think, — in which its errors were pointed out, and with so much ability, that Ritter remodelled his sketch of Plato according to the more correct opinions of his reviewer. This service to the history of philosophy was performed, we believe, by Dr. H. F. Hermann, the accomplished Professor in the University of Marburg, and author of a learned work entitled "*Geschichte und System der Platonischen Philosophie*," which Dr. Anthon would have done well to use more than he seems to have done. We have, therefore, in

Professor Anthon's Dictionary, instead of a well-considered view of Plato and his school, drawn from original sources and from the latest and best illustrative works, a copy, to a considerable extent, of an English translation of statements, rejected upon fuller investigation, by their author himself. We had intended to follow out this branch of our subject somewhat further ; but we have only room to mention a few miscellaneous omissions with such desultory comment as may occur.

If the classical scholar should chance, in the course of his studies, to meet with the name of Polus, the celebrated actor, he will not find it in the " Classical Dictionary," excepting where it is incidentally mentioned in the article " Theatre," under the head of actors. The name does not occur in its alphabetical place ; and nothing is stated of this somewhat famous personage, when the name occurs, except the fact of his having made the sum of a talent by the performances of two days. He will be astonished to find no mention of Zenodotus, the celebrated critic of Alexandria, and one of the revisers of the Homeric poems ; of Zenobius, a collector of proverbs still extant, and found in Gaisford's " *Paræmiographi Græci* " ; nor of a writer of the same name and the author of a small tract on the cries of animals, published by Valckenaer ; nor of another, a writer belonging to Træzen, who was a stoic philosopher. Besides the Zenos, mentioned by Dr. Anthon, there were, a Sidonian, an Epicurean, whom Cicero heard at Athens ; another, a sophist and physician, of whom an account is given by Eunapius ; another from Rhodes, an historian contemporary with Polybius. We do not find the name of Zeuxippus, of Gnossus, an Academic philosopher, and the successor of Ænesidemus who flourished under Augustus ; nor of Zeuxis, the medical writer of the same name, who commented on Hippocrates ; nor of Zeuxis, the Satrap of Lydia, under Antiochus the Great. Zopyrus, an historian, of Byzantium, is not mentioned ; nor the physiognomist, of the same name, contemporary with Socrates, who pronounced the famous character of the philosopher, that he was stupid and licentious, and who is spoken of several times by Cicero ; nor is Zopyrio, the Alexandrian grammarian ; nor Zosimus, the author of a life of Demosthenes ; nor Zoticus, of Smyrna, the infamous favorite of Eliogabalus ; nor Zeuxidamus, son of Archidamus, king of Sparta ; nor the Spartan of the same name, the son of Leotychides ; nor Zenarchus, the Peripatetic philosopher, born at Seleucia, in Cilicia, whom Strabo heard,

and who taught at Alexandria, Athens, and Rome, and enjoyed the patronage of Augustus ; nor Zenodorus, a petty ruler in Trachonitis, who drew upon himself the displeasure of Augustus by encouraging the plundering of the caravans which passed through his country, and part of whose territory was bestowed on Herod.

Professor Anthon speaks of having devoted particular attention to the geographical articles ; and some of them are prepared apparently with elaborate care. After a somewhat close examination, we have the same charges to bring against his method of proceeding in this department, that we have already brought against other parts of the work. We mean the taking of entire articles, with slight alterations, from other writers, copying the authorities cited by them, and placing the author's name at the end, as a collateral authority ; as if the articles had been written by Dr. Anthon himself, and the real author had only been consulted among others ; and in the next place many omissions. Cramer's Greece has been a most convenient mine from which to obtain articles of this sort ; not the materials simply, but the finished articles. For example, more than three columns are taken bodily from Cramer, in the article on Thessaly ; about twenty-four lines are from some other source ; and at the end we have this imposing array of authorities “ (Xen. Hist. Gr. 6. 1. 4 ; Aristot. de Rep. 2. 9 ; Cram. Anc. Greece, Vol. 1, p. 343, sqq.) ” In the original part of the article, it is said, “ Its coasts, especially the Sinus Pagasæus, afforded the best harbour for shipping ; ” but the coast of Magnesia was noted for being ἀλλήμενος, or *harbourless*, as it is expressly called by Euripides. The article on Thrace, too, is constructed in the same way ; it is all *taken*, with a few slight changes, and the omission of a few sentences. Many other principal geographical articles are *done* upon the same convenient plan.

Full as are some portions of the geographical department, there is, as has been hinted, an immense number of omissions of names which occur in common authors. The student who should rely wholly on Dr. Anthon, for geographical illustrations of almost any author, would find his work, with the exception of the more important names, quite unsatisfactory. Our opinion is, that a classical dictionary ought to contain all the names of places, even the smallest, that are mentioned by one or at most by two authors. If we try Dr. Anthon's book by this rule, the deficiencies will be found surprising.

Taking a single letter, the last for example, we shall find a very large number of geographical names utterly neglected. Some of them are not of much importance, but all occur in good authors. The following are instances. Zabda, a fortress on the Tigris, called also Phœnice, lying north-east of Nisibis. This occurs in the Dictionary under Zabdicene, but not by itself, or under its other name, Bezabda; the surrounding people were called Zabdiceni. Zagrus, or Zagrius, the point of Mount Taurus, separating Media from Assyria. Zaitha, or Zantha, a town in Mesopotamia, near the Chaboras. Here, or at the neighbouring town of Dura, the Emperor Gordian was buried. Zalake, a town of north Media, on the Amardus (which also is omitted), mentioned by Ptolemy. Zaradrus, or Hesidrus, (neither name is given by Anthon,) supposed by Mannert to be the Suttledge. Zadracarta, the principal city of Hyrcania, mentioned by Arrian and others. Zenodotium, a castle in Mesopotamia. Zethis, a town in Carmania, mentioned by Pliny. Zimara, a town of lesser Armenia, on the west bank of the Euphrates, — according to Mannert twelve geographical miles distant from the junction of its two arms. Zagora, or Zagoron, mentioned by Arrian, a castle between the Halys and Sinope. Zalecus, or Zaliscus, a river of Paphlagonia, two hundred and ten stades northwest of the Halys. Zaliche, or Leontopolis, a town of Paphlagonia, probably lying in a mountain pass near the Zaliscus. Zama, a town of Cappadocia, near the northwest border of the country, six geographical miles northwest of Sarnena. Zara, a town in the northern part of Cappadocia, between Carinisa and Nicopolis. Zenobia, a town founded by the Queen of Palmyra, on the site of Thapsacus. Zephyrium, besides the two mentioned by Anthon, 1. a promontory and town of Pontus, ninety stades from Tripolis, now Zefre, or Zafra, known to various ancient authors; 2. a place sixty stades from the promontory of Carambis, in Paphlagonia; 3. a promontory of Crete, now Cape St. Juan; 4. another of Marmarica; 5. another of Cyrene. Zigana, or Ziganna, a town of Cappadocia not far south of Trapezus, known to the Itin. Anton., and garrisoned by the *secunda cohors Valentiana*. Zoropassus, a town in Cappadocia. Zoparistus, do. Zermizegethusa, a royal residence or town in Dacia, near Graditz, in Wallachia, (Dio Cass. Lib. 68.) Zaca, an old town in Bœotia; (Steph. Byz.) Zarex, 1. a town and mountain of Laconia; (the town lay two hundred stades from Epidaurus, and

belonged to the Eleutherolacones, when that confederacy was instituted); 2. a rock in Eubœa (Cramer). Zelassium, a promontory of Magnesia, above Demetrias, opposite to the islands now called Trikkero (Cramer). Zephyre, an island near Crete, off Cape Sammonium, one of those now called Grades. Zelea, an old and important town of Bithynia, mentioned in Homer as on the Æsepus. Its troops were commanded by Pandarus in the Trojan war. To this place belonged Arthmius, who came into Greece to bribe the Athenians and others about the time of the Persian war; (Demosthenes, Æschin, &c.) Zerynthus, a place near Ænus, in Thrace, where Apollo was worshipped, and a cave existed, sacred to Hecate. Zoster, a promontory of Attica, near the *demus* Anagyrhasia, consisting of several small projecting points which the fleet of Xerxes mistook for ships (Herod.). Zea, the outer part of the Piræus at Athens. Zoetia, or Zoeteum, in Arcadia, a town deserted in the days of Pausanias, but containing temples of Demeter and Artemis. Zygætes, a river of Thrace, that takes its rise in the Rhodope mountains. It is joined by the Argitas, which gives name to the united stream (Col. Leake). We observe, too, in the article "Ægypt," that Ægyptus, as the ancient name of the river Nile, is omitted, although it is spoken of in the Odyssey.

In the article Pharos, Professor Anthon makes the surprising statement, that the tower which bore that name "was built with white marble, and could be seen at the distance of 100 miles." Truly, it must have been not only one of the seven wonders of the world, but a greater wonder than all the seven put together. It would have been visible from Memphis, and about half way to the island of Cyprus; it would have been twenty-four times as high as Bunker Hill Monument will be when completed, and nearly ten times as high as the Pyramid of Cheops. Had it been a mile high it could have been seen only at the distance of ninety-six miles and a half. Further on, he says; "The name *Pharos* itself would seem to have been given to the tower first, and after that to the island, if the Greek etymology be the true one, according to which the term comes from the Greek *φάω* to shine, or be bright." But the island was called Pharos in the time of Homer.

Νῆσος ἑπειτά τις ἔστι πολυκλύστη ἐνὶ πόντῳ,
Αἰγύπτου προπάροιθε — Φάρον δὲ ἰ κικλήσκουσιν.

Odyssey, Lib. IV. 354, 355.

Of course, then, it could not have derived its name from a tower built in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, some half dozen centuries later.

It will be perceived by our readers, that we have wholly passed by several departments of the work we have been reviewing ; not for want of materials for comment, in the way both of praise and censure, but because our limits forbid us to prosecute the examination further at present. Notwithstanding the inaccuracies and omissions we have felt it our duty to point out, we repeat what we said at the beginning, that Dr. Anthon's "*Classical Dictionary*" is the best in the English language, and will be found in many points an extremely useful book. We regret that a scholar of his powers and attainments and opportunities, should have allowed himself to hurry into the literary world a work of so great importance, with all its imperfections on its head. Professor Anthon owed it to his fame for scholarship, to the reputation of his country, and to the generation of young men whom his works are exerting a great influence in forming, to expend his most anxious care, and the patient labors of many years, to exhaust all the learning of his capacious memory, and to apply all the powers of his vigorous reason, in making a classical dictionary fit to stand the test of the severest scrutiny at home and abroad ; at once complete, condensed, harmonized, digested, and consistent ; a work to be relied upon for the accuracy, as well as respected for the amount, of information it contains ; a work to which he might with justice assert the fullest claims of authorship. Such a work, the present *Classical Dictionary* can with no propriety be called. Nor is the typographical part entitled to all the praise which Dr. Anthon awards it, in his preface. Mr. Drisler, to whom he says the work is indebted for most of its correctness, has hastily and imperfectly performed the duty assigned him. We have noticed many minute errors, many instances of false accentuation in Greek words, many mistakes in numbers, and inconsistencies in dates, which ought not to have escaped that gentleman's critical eye. We still hope that Dr. Anthon will use his abundant materials in preparing a book, more worthy of the high position he occupies in the literature of the United States, and more useful to those for whose benefit it was intended.
